

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated August 29, 2006, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-22 are pending. Claims 1-22 have been rejected. Claims 1, 13 and 22 are independent claims from which claims 2-12 and 14-21 respectively depend. Claims 1, 10, 13 and 22 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Support for the amendments can be found in the application as originally filed in paragraphs [0054] - [0056] and elsewhere.

Confirmation of Acceptance of Formal Drawings

Applicants thank the Examiner for accepting the formal drawings filed by Applicants on December 31, 2003.

§101 Rejections

Claims 1-22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101. The claims have been amended to overcome these rejections. Applicants respectfully submit that amended claims 1-22 are proper and request the withdrawal of the 101 rejections of these claims.

§112 Rejections

Claim 10 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Claim 10 has been amended. Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 10 is proper and request the withdrawal of the 112 rejections of this claim.

§102(e) Rejections

Claims 1-8, 13, 18, 19, 21-22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Le, (U.S. Publ. No. 2005/0076036 A1). It is respectfully submitted that these claims are patentable because Le does not disclose or suggest all the features of Applicants' amended claims 1, 13 and 22, from which claims 2-8, 18, 19 and 21 depend.

Le is directed to updating data cubes using hierarchical dependency relationships to identify areas of the data that have changed and refreshing only the data that has been affected by the change. A set of relational tables that comprise Le's star schema includes the fact table (the main table) and related dimension tables. An aggregate table is defined that includes an aggregation of a defined subset of data from at least one fact table and the

associated dimension tables. By identifying and using the subset of the hierarchically represented data, refresh operations are limited to only the subset of data related to the changed data. Le does not disclose or suggest at least specifying a persistence model for the target datastore, wherein the persistence model comprises persisting metadata in the target datastore such that changes to metadata of an object in the source datastore are not updated in the target datastore until the object data is altered, persisting both metadata and data changes in the target datastore or persisting neither metadata nor data in the target datastore such that any change made to the source datastore is propagated to the target datastore, as recited by Applicants' amended independent claims. As Le does not disclose or suggest all the non-obvious features of Applicants' amended claims, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the 102 rejections of these claims.

§103(a) Rejections

Claims 11, 12 and 14-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Le. For the reasons stated above, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the 103 rejections of these claims as Le does not disclose or suggest all the non-obvious features of Applicants' amended independent claims 1 and 13 from which these claims depend.

Claim 20 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Le in view of Pasumansky et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,477,536). Pasumansky does not cure the deficiencies of Le. Pasumansky is directed to creating virtual cubes from a subset of dimensions and measures of a source cube. Pasumansky does not disclose or suggest at least specifying a persistence model for the target datastore, wherein the persistence model comprises persisting metadata in the target datastore such that changes to metadata of an object in the source datastore is not updated in the target datastore until the object data is altered, persisting both metadata and data changes in the target datastore or persisting neither metadata nor data in the target datastore such that any change made to the source datastore is propagated to the target datastore, as recited by Applicants' amended independent claims. As neither Le nor Pasumansky alone or in combination disclose or suggest all the non-obvious features of Applicants' amended claims, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the 103 rejections of these claims.

Claims 9 and 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Le in view of Daniel et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,785,689). Daniel is directed to mapping multiple source schemas into a target content schema. Daniel does not disclose or suggest at least specifying a persistence model for the target datastore, wherein the persistence model comprises persisting metadata in the target datastore such that changes to metadata of an object in the source datastore is not updated in the target datastore until the object data is altered, persisting both metadata and data changes in the target datastore or persisting neither metadata nor data in the target datastore such that any change made to the source datastore is propagated to the target datastore, as recited by Applicants' amended independent claim 1 from which these claims depend. As neither Le nor Daniel alone or in combination disclose or suggest all the non-obvious features of Applicants' amended claims, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the 103 rejections of these claims.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present Application is in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejections of the claims and an early allowance is earnestly solicited.

Date: November 29, 2006

/Susan C. Murphy/
Susan C. Murphy
Registration No. 46,221

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre 12th Floor
2929 Arch Street
Philadelphia PA 19104
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439